

national consultations and confirms the fact that king crab are to be counted as Continental Shelf resources.

I now turn to another problem area which the ratification of the convention brings to light, and introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the State's regulatory jurisdiction over Continental Shelf fishery resources. Our present domestic legislation does not provide a definite locus for such regulatory responsibility. Neither the Federal Government nor the State governments now have statutory authority to provide directly for the conservation of these resources. My bill would assign responsibilities for the fishery resources of the Continental Shelf to the several States.

It is clear that at the present time some States are in fact regulating their fishery resources through the adoption of so-called landing laws. These State laws prohibit the landing, sale, or transportation of fishery resources taken from the Continental Shelf if they have been taken in a manner not consistent with the regulations the States have adopted vis-a-vis their territorial seas.

Nevertheless, I believe that the matter should be clarified. States should be formally and effectively enabled to regulate their Continental Shelf fisheries just as they do their other fisheries. Federal legislation of this nature should be consistent with congressional policy, as expressed in the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1954. These acts confirm State jurisdiction over fishery resources within territorial waters. My bill would simply extend this jurisdiction to cover fishery resources of the Continental Shelf outside territorial waters.

Now it is true that the same 1954 legislation placed the mineral resources of the Outer Continental Shelf under Federal jurisdiction. The Secretary of the Interior was granted authority to administer the leasing of the outer shelf lands and to provide for the prevention of waste and misuse, in cooperation with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States. The rationale operating here, however, involved a consideration of the substantial monetary value of the mineral leases and royalties, as well as the static and semipermanent quality of the lessees' operations. Living fishery resources are not comparable to these mineral resources. Leases and royalties are not involved; the operations are not as permanent, nor their number as limited.

Jurisdiction over fishery resources, of course, implies only the responsibility for managing the resources so that they will be conserved and developed for the benefit of present and future generations. Since the States are currently responsible for the resources within territorial waters and on the seabed beneath these waters, it seems logical and practical to extend this responsibility to the Outer Continental Shelf. Otherwise, split jurisdictions would result from Federal management of resources adjacent to those under State control. Division of regulatory responsibility is a costly and difficult if not impossible task

on both the States and the Federal Government.

As I introduce this Continental Shelf fisheries bill, I naturally am aware of the overriding importance of civil rights legislation and other business pending before the Senate. Nevertheless, I introduce the bill at this time to foster a heightened awareness among my colleagues and the general public as to the merits of and the need for such legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2903) to provide for the conservation of certain fishery resources on the seabed or in the subsoil of the Outer Continental Shelf, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each State, Commonwealth, or possession having jurisdiction over the fisheries within territorial waters of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the management, regulation, and conservation of living organisms belonging to the sedentary species which appertain to the United States pursuant to the Convention on the Continental Shelf recommended by the United Nations International Convention on the Law of the Sea and ratified by the United States on April 12, 1961, from that portion of the Continental Shelf which is contiguous to the boundaries of the State, Commonwealth, or possession.

SEC. 2. The boundaries of each State, Commonwealth or possession extending seaward to the outer margin of the Continental Shelf shall be determined and defined by the President as provided in section 4(2) of the Outer Continental Lands Act.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

Statement by him relating to the National Day of Portugal.

Article entitled "The Presidency: Succession and Disability," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald on June 9, 1964.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Resolution of board of directors of Southern States Industrial Council in opposition to civil rights bill (H.R. 7192).

By Mr. BEALL:

Statements at ceremonies in connection with the dedication of the Blaustein Building in Baltimore.

SOUTHEAST ASIA AND LAOS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is sad when the United States violates international law by sending armed planes over South Vietnam. The United States now

stands in violation of the Geneva accords of both 1954 and 1962 in Laos as well as in South Vietnam. In this morning's newspapers we read that the United States is temporarily subsiding from sending armed planes over Laos, but assurance is given that our desisting may be only temporary.

It is a fact that the United States is in clear violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962. Those accords specifically prohibit sending into Laos any armed planes or any armed military personnel, by any foreign power. We have done both. We in fact have committed acts of war in both Laos and South Vietnam in clear violation of the Constitution of the United States, the Geneva accords, and the United Nations Charter. Our record of irresponsibility in the realm of foreign affairs is inexcusable and a national shame.

Mr. President, it is also sad that the officials of the United Nations are not calling the United States to an accounting. The United States and Red China are certainly violating the Geneva accords. I think North Vietnam and South Vietnam are doing so, too, and probably Cambodia. Certainly this matter should be brought without delay before the United Nations. The Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, cannot justify his failure to call the United States to an accounting for its outlawing.

I regret that the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, has so completely failed to fulfill his responsibilities of trusteeship to the United Nations, under its charter. In my opinion he has nullified his leadership and weakened his effectiveness. He has extinguished his lamp of international statesmanship.

Mr. President, if the United States and Red China are not stopped in the war-making program they are conducting in southeast Asia, millions of Americans and millions of the peoples of other countries in the world will be jeopardized, because the United States and Red China cannot proceed, as they are now proceeding without ending up in war. They are fast getting themselves into a position in which some accident or deliberate act of military aggression will start a war between the United States and Red China. Such a war would jeopardize all mankind. I believe it is vital to world peace that my country place the whole southeast Asia crisis before the United Nations, with a formal request that it take over jurisdiction under the United Nations Charter.

In speaking in the Senate during the past several weeks I have quoted at some length from articles 33, 37, and 51 of the United Nations Charter. At the moment I now speak, the United States stands guilty of violating those and other sections of the United Nations Charter as a result of its conduct in southeast Asia.

But, Mr. President, there is still time for our Government to change its course of outlawry in southeast Asia and to bring this whole issue under the canopy of the United Nations, for determination under the rules and procedures of international law in the United Nations Charter.

I shall continue to point out that the Government of the United States stands in violation of international law in southeast Asia as long as there is any hope of bringing my country back into the framework of international law. Unfortunately, we have in the Pentagon Building and the State Department too many men at a policy-recommending level who seem determined to lead our country into war.

Mr. President, I repeat and shall continue to warn our people that events in southeast Asia, and especially in Laos, indicate that the United States and Red China are headed into an open conflict with each other. Both countries are flagrantly violating the Geneva accords of 1954 governing Vietnam and of 1962 governing Laos. If it is in the nature of power giants that they cannot control events once they set out to execute a given policy, surely there are other nations in the world who are still capable of stepping in to separate the United States and China by some international intervention.

In Laos, the American military has become so involved and so committed to military activity of its own that it has sent armed planes flown by American pilots over Laos in direct violation of the 1962 Geneva agreement. That agreement provides that military arms may be sent into Laos at the request of the Laotian Government; but personnel may not. In fact, the accord forbids "the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations and foreign military personnel into Laos."

Yet our pilots are taking part in the Laotian war. So, like the Communist neighbors who are helping the Pathet Lao, the United States is becoming an international outlaw in pursuit of its own nationalist objectives. We are not enforcing any of these agreements. We are only helping to destroy them once and for all.

Communist imperialism against a close neighbor is being countered by American imperialism in a country 7,000 miles away. That is some position for the United States of America to be taking in 1964, 19 years after we signed the United Nations Charter, and with our signature pledged to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered. Our flights in Laos are endangering peace, security, and justice in southeast Asia. They are in violation of the Geneva accord of 1962. They are not in defense of the United States; and apparently, they are not even in keeping with the wishes of the Laotian Government.

Yesterday's press reports that the neutralist Premier, Souvanna Phouma, is asking that all reconnaissance and armed escort flights be stopped. Like Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, he is discovering that when China and the United States are allowed to dispute his territory, there is little chance that local populations and local leaders will have much to say about the outcome. Left to themselves, China and the United States will escalate the Indochina conflict into a full-

scale war. Prince Souvanna Phouma and General Khanh of South Vietnam will not have anything left to govern if they allow this escalation to continue.

There must be a third-party intervention, preferably by the United Nations, very soon. And somehow, some way, there must be some sanity brought into American policy in Asia. The only policy we have followed to date is to meet one violation of international law with our own violation of international law, to meet war by making more war. To continue following that policy will bring disaster down on the heads of the American nation and the American people.

Why? According to the New York Times reporter, Hedrick Smith, who writes from Washington:

Officials here remain convinced that U.S. prestige is at stake. They say that the unarmed reconnaissance flights—with their armed escort fighters—must be contained as much for prestige reasons as for the purpose of obtaining photographs of Communist troop movements and positions in Laos.

How many soldiers and even civilians have been killed throughout modern history for the sake of someone else's prestige? Tens of millions, at least. The Japanese warlords were reputed to have said after World War II that the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki enabled them to surrender "with honor," whereas their honor would have compelled them to fight indefinitely if only conventional weapons had been used against them.

Most of the 37 million casualties of World War I can be attributed directly to the rival "prestige" of the ruling monarchies of Europe, plus France's dismay at the prestige lost by its army in the war of 1870. What came out of that war were not only millions of dead and wounded, but the disappearance of the same monarchies and ruling classes who thought their national prestige was worth a war.

What American prestige is at stake in Laos? I suspect it is not so much the prestige of the United States as it is the prestige of the military and diplomatic officials who for 10 years have been pursuing a hopeless and bankrupt policy in southeast Asia.

It is their faces that must be saved by sending American military forces into the fray, however illegal, however fruitless, and however disastrous their participation may be. How many southeast Asians are going to die for American prestige? How many Americans?

The American people must demand an end to their Government's present policy in Asia, and the United Nations must step in to save itself and tens of millions of people from destruction.

What an irony it is that even while we are preparing to fight a war in Asia, we are intervening to prevent a war in the Mediterranean.

We are telling Greece and Turkey that a war between them over Cyprus is unthinkable. Apparently the U.S. 6th Fleet is available to interpose itself between Cyprus and any Turkish invasion force.

Our diplomats are eagerly looking for "face saving" solutions that will permit Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus to pull back

from the brink of war. According to the New York Times:

The sources said Washington would like the Turkish and Greek leaders to meet in search of a solution. One solution that is getting increasing attention despite Greek objections involves transferring Turkish Cypriots who are willing to leave the island to some Turkish-inhabited Greek territory that could then be ceded to Turkey.

The Johnson administration recognizes that there are all sorts of face-saving problems for both Greece and Turkey in such a solution. That is why, officials said, Mr. Ball spoke today of the realism and generosity needed from both sides.

Mr. President, why is war between Greece and Turkey unthinkable when war in southeast Asia seems entirely acceptable to the administration?

Why is a diplomatic solution suitable for Greece and Turkey, but beyond the realm of consideration for our own "face saving" problem in Asia?

Why do we urge Greece and Turkey "to meet in search of a solution" but reject all proposals for meetings to solve our Asian problem?

Why is the United States in the very bad position of acting as world policeman, enforcing our version of law and order upon others intent on violence, but feeling quite free to break the law ourselves when it suits our purpose to do so?

Let me point out to Greece, Turkey and the rest of the world that their little war in the Mediterranean would be nothing compared to a Sino-American conflict in Asia.

Our American officials are adept at designing diplomatic solutions for others while we insist upon military solutions for American foreign policy problems. If the world is going to save itself from war in Asia, it is going to have to intervene through the United Nations to impose a "face saving" solution upon the United States and China.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed. The time, under the morning hour limitation, has expired.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee substitute is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.